



**73<sup>rd</sup> Student Senate**  
**Rules of Procedure Ad Hoc Committee Agenda**  
**DATE | Zoom Meeting ID: 909 196 4098**

**Call to Order: 6:12 pm**

**Members Present:** Linsky, Tackett, Rowan, Randall, Soto

**Members Tardy:** None

**Members Absent:** None

**Guests:** None

**Approval of the Minutes:**

- 

**Announcements:**

- None

**Student Comments:**

- None

**Committee Business:**

- Linsky: Senator Tackett brought to my attention that Senator Lessard took a leave of absence. Do we want to recruit more individuals or put out an open call for any senators to join?
- Rowan: Recruiting to the chairs would be good. Having one or two more people would be nice
- Soto: I think recruiting the chairs first is smart and then asking other senators.
- Linsky: It would be nice to have some new senators in here to get them involved. I agree that we should get some chairs in here as well. I am going to send a message in the Rules and Calendar chat to see if any chairs are willing to join for the summer and I will have Harmon contact new senators. I feel confident with the team we have now, and I would like for new senators to be a part of this environment as well.
- Randall: I would caution with recruiting new senators. These issues are minutiae and come from an experience that these new senators do not have
- Linsky: There are some risks with taking this on especially with risking quorum fails. But we should definitely reach out. I think it is important to give those new senators the opportunity to get involved in something so productive like this. Moving on, lets start with Rule 5.
- Randall: I will start by reading it out. After reading 5.1, how do we feel about the section that reconsiders committee assignments by a 3/4th vote.



- Rowan: This issue will come up again later on, so we need to be uniform.
- Randall: I would argue that the decision to reconsider bill assignments and committee assignments are different.
- Rowan: The issue is about whether the vote of the senate should get the last binding decision.
- Randall: Theoretically, everything can be overturned through a motion to overrule the chair.
- Linsky: Yes that is correct.
- Randall: So this rule holds a higher threshold. I feel that if even  $\frac{1}{3}$  of the senate has an issue with where they are assigned, then maybe we should lower the limit.
- Linsky: I am hesitant. The amount of work that it takes to come to a consensus would make it difficult for everyone to be happy. This rule also comes off as a referendum to the current leadership
- Rowan: What about moving it to a 2/3rds since that is the same requirement needed as a no-confidence vote.
- Linsky: Should we just cut the rule out altogether?
- Rowan: There would be a bunch of motions for individual senators instead of the assignment as a whole.
- Linsky: Yeah I agree, that is a good point.
- Rowan: We should make the ex officio member stuff its own rule. It should be a separate sub-rule at least so we can elaborate further on the committee assignments
- Linsky: Yes that makes sense
- Rowan: In the past, someone was bringing up rule 5.1 because former summer senate Darildik tried to change committee assignments moving from summer to fall. They went to the summer senate, did those committees. Then at the end of it we came to the conclusion that summer was stand-alone and those committee assignments do not carry over. The former president reassigned the committees at the “halfway” point between spring to fall. April 15th was the first meeting post-inauguration in Spring 2020. It was the inauguration, and that was their final meeting until they went into summer.
- Randall: We need not to think about COVID and need to look at these rules as if we are in the Senate Chambers in the Student Union.
- Linsky: Let’s put a pin in that issue. I think changing it to a 2/3rds vote makes more sense.
- Randall: We should also change the word “reconsider” to “redo”. We should also change the word “request” to “reorder”
- Rowan: I agree
- Linsky: I have no issues with ex-officio members.
- Tackett: I have an issue with 5.2 and the ex-officio members.
- ---
- Rowan: Should we have the Pro-temp be able to be an ex-officio member for all the committees
- Randall: That is a good point. PAC and RTAC have had issues with the quorum
- Soto: Having both the president and pro-tempore as voting members is important. In finance, we have benefited from having both individuals.



- Linsky: I am adding the language “ex-officio voting member” to specify that they are voting members.
- Rowan: According to Roberts, the ex-officio members are not truly a member of that committee
- Linsky: It is like Puerto Rico and congress - PR doesn't have the right to vote but can be heard none the less. We will take a 5-minute break and meet back up at 7:00 pm.
- Linsky: Getting back into it, I feel like 5.3 and 5.4 are similar enough to just combine.
- Randall: I do not like 5.4
- Linsky: I like it because it states that non-voting members can't count towards or against quorum. This goes with the previous issues we just talked about.
- Rowan: When a non-senator is recognized, they are not allowed to debate. But this rule allows for these non-senate individuals to be able to debate
- Linsky: So they are essentially liaisons?
- Randall: I like the sound of these. We could write this into statutes
- Linsky: Let's move on to 5.5
- Randall: I will read it
- Rowan: Let's look at 5.5a.
- Linsky: We should change the words “resignation, impeachment or departure” to “vacancy of the committee chair”
- Rowan: What are we striking that whole clause from “an upon...” to “...Vice-Chair”. We don't want to make that every time there is a casual vacancy, the entire senate must meet and go to caucus.
- Randall: let's add “when a Chair or Vice-chair vacates their position, an election shall immediately be held to fill the vacancy” as its own rule.
- Rowan: I think you should add for it to say “in the same committee meeting”
- Randall: If we add that, it can be loosely interpreted and no business would be done
- Linsky: I think there should be a separate clause for Vice-Chair positions. What if they resign in the middle of a meeting to the effect of losing quorum?
- Randall: We should just have there be an election immediately.
- Rowan: We could do it so that a temporary chair is appointed and then an election is held at the next meeting.
- Randall: We should have the election immediately
- Linsky: But then we have more elections, upon other elections - when do these elections end?
- Rowan: I think we can come to the conclusion for the language that “an election for a vice-chair must be held prior to the resumption of business”.
- Randall: Do we want to do the temporary Vice-Chair clause? How do we like the language “When a senator vacates a vice-chair position, the Chair may appoint an interim Vice-Chair for the remainder of the meeting or immediately hold elections for the Vice-Chair position. If an interim Vice-Chair is appointed, an election for the Vice-Chair position must be held at the end of the meeting where the vacancy occurred.
- Rowan: I like it. Let's look at the next points. I see no problem with 5.5.C.
- Randall: The position of the “Senate Program Assistant” and the “SGA Associate Director Position” no longer exist so we need to cut that.
- Rowan: Once we do that, one of you will need to go into statutes and fix that. They are referenced several times especially during impeachment statutes



- Linsky: What if we specifically included the “parliamentarian and clerk” in 5.5.C.
- Rowan: No, because there will be times when those positions will be vacated.
- Linsky: Fair enough.
- Randall: This looks good as it is right now for the overseer positions.
- Linsky. I am fine with everything in 5.5.D
- Randall: Me too
- Rowan: I am okay with 5.5.E as well. It is the same in statutes
- Linsky: I think it is fine. Moving on to the next one, I do not like secret ballots.
- Tackett: I like secret ballots
- Linsky: I feel like secret ballots are not fully democratic and can not be held fully accountable
- Randall: I do understand the politicization of the chair elections. Mostly because of the seat at Rules and Calendar. But I do see Linsky’s point about accountability.
- Tackett: I think I am okay with giving up the secret ballots position. Let’s cut it.
- Randall: Do we like 5.5.I
- Tackett: Yes
- Linsky: Yes I like it.
- Tackett: Are we done with 5.5?
- Linsky: Yes I think we are. In 5.6, let’s get rid of the “Notebook” clauses. No one does that.
- Randall: Yes I agree. Looking at 5.6.E, isn't this already a thing? When someone is not present, isn't the legislation tabled?
- Linsky: Yes, but let’s wait for Jack to get back. We will break until 8:00pm.
- Rowan: So, what is supposed to happen by Roberts Rules, there is a motion to table the legislation and the chair asks for an objection. This lets legislation get tabled in the event that the sponsor is not there.
- Linsky: I like it, that makes sense. Moving to 5.7, it seems straightforward.
- Rowan: In 5.8 let’s just strike the “ex-officio” language.
- Randall: We need to get rid of it since we just dealt with that issue, if any future changes come up they will not contradict themselves.
- Rowan: I am good with the rest of 5.8. Let’s go to 5.9.
- Randall: Let’s read it
- Linsky: I will be removing “different” in 5.9.a because it is repetitive.
- Rowan: I think it is important to add the word “and motion” instead of “suggest” in 5.9.a
- Linsky: Lets get rid of it.
- Rowan: Do you still have an issue with 5.9.B Randall?
- Randall: Yes, it is not the precedent. Is this  $\frac{2}{3}$  requirement necessary
- Rowan: I think it is, especially for in-person meetings. It is important so people can look over the bill. Are we okay with the  $\frac{2}{3}$  requirement
- Linsky: I’m fine with it either way, let rules fight over it if they don’t like it.
- Randall: Yes. Let’s read over 5.10. We need to cut “acing chair” in 5.10.a
- Linsky: In 5.10.B, I want to cut the language of “non-committee” members not debating. This is an obligation for the chair to cut them off and I don’t want to make chairs give the business to other community leaders.



- Rowan: We should just let that rule be at the discretion of the chair and put the language “unless permitted by the chair”.
- Linsky: I like that, it works. Let’s cut the “signature of the chair” on each of the minutes.
- Randall: I agree.
- Linsky: let’s take a 5-minute break
- Rowan: Looking at 5.13, there was confusion on how to make an ad-hoc
- Linsky: I am fine with 5.13.a
- Randall: I just do not want random ad-hocs being created.
- Rowan: That is why there is a vote requirement.
- Linsky: It looks like there is considerable disagreement with 5.14.
- Rowan: I made that rule because I wanted the process for committees drafting legislation to be laid out
- Linsky: As a principle, I do not bills being referred without an actual sponsor’s name
- Randall: I feel like this can be done through a roundtable.
- Rowan: I am okay with cutting it. I am okay with 5.15. 5.16 seems like a statutory issue. Do we want to talk about the 1/10 rule?
- Randall: I will make a note of that and deal with that in statutes later. If it is in statutes I do not want it in Rules.
- Rowan: Lets double check statutes and make sure it is there. Lets cut it
- Tackett: I agree
- Rowan: It looks like we can cut most of 5.17 since we already fixed this
- Randall: Let’s read over it to double-check. Do we have anything about the vice-chair assuming the powers of the chair?
- Tackett: I believe that it is included under the powers of the vice-chair.
- Rowan: There is something there but it is in reference to the removal of the chair. We should also reformat 5.5 so that the rules are in order of their procedural duties.
- Linsky: Should we just take 5.17 and put it under the subsections of 5.5 with the other vacancy stuff?
- Tackett: Yes that makes sense
- Randall: Yes. Let’s move to 5.18
- Rowan: It is harsh, but looks good.
- Linsky: We are now over 1/3rd the way through with our first past. Next meeting we can probably get through rules 6,7, and 8. I’ll entertain a **motion to adjourn**
- Randall: **So moved**
- Rowan: **So Seconded**

#### **Old Business:**

- None

#### **New Business:**

- None

#### **Unfinished Business:**



- None

**Final Announcements:** None

**Date and Time of Next Meeting:** 6/17 at 6:00pm

**Adjourned:** 9:11pm

**Meeting recording:**

<https://drive.google.com/file/d/15K63Fk5Ps3tllkyb3IHZxFFGj6nL64PD/view?usp=sharing>

*Matthew E. Linsky*